



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

all you bishops from the promise by which you are bound, against the constitution of the Church, to observe them?"

Is it not a brave thing to hear an archbishop QUASH the laws of England, which he himself had sworn, "in good faith, and on the word of truth," to observe and keep? But there are archbishops in Ireland now who would be only too happy to quash the laws of England if they dared.

Archbishop Becket stated in that letter what laws he quashed. One of them was—"That clergymen should be tried in the Secular Courts" for murder and other such crimes. But Becket thought (and perhaps he thought sincerely, for the mind of man is subject to great delusions, under a false system) that in protecting a murderer from punishment he was fighting for a great Christian principle. Hear his own account, in a letter to the Pope: "That is snatched from Jesus Christ, which HE PURCHASED WITH HIS OWN BLOOD: the secular power extends its hand into his own inheritance (the clergy), nor do the canons now prevail even to protect the clergy (when guilty of murder), who were exempt by special privilege from this jurisdiction."

That exemption and privilege, founded on the forged decretal epistles, the Popes long and earnestly laboured to establish in Europe. The English clergy themselves, in the time of Becket, recorded their opinion of its working, in a letter which they addressed to the Pope. "The peace of the kingdom was very much disturbed by the insolence and crimes of some of the clergy; the king, for the safety of his people, pressed the bishops, after their censures, to give such guilty persons up to the laws, because bare degrading, which was all the Church's censures reached to, was by no means sufficient punishment for wilful murder. This liberty was extended even to a licitor, or acolythus."¹

The history of the actors in this contest is full of melancholy interest. King Henry was provoked by the outrageous conduct of Becket to exclaim, "Will ne one rid me of this man." Four of his servants who heard it went and murdered Becket in his church.

Far be it from us to palliate the crimson guilt of murder. Yet it is a striking instance of retribution, that he who laboured to establish impunity for murder in his own order, died himself by the hand of murderers.

Murder does not turn a perfidious man into a saint: yet the Pope canonized "St. Thomas of Canterbury"; and he is still worshipped as saint and celebrated as a "gloriosus pontifex" in the Breviary for the 29th of December.

Hence, our readers may see why it is that we who honour and reverence the saints of God are so jealous of the Pope's saints; for Becket was a saint after the Pope's own heart.

But, there is a God, and murder never prospers. Would to God that all Irishmen would learn this lesson. The horror at the deed was so great, that King Henry II., brave and resolute as he was, was forced to submit the ancient laws of his kingdom to the pleasure of the bishops of Rome.

But King Henry II. was cunning, too, when he was beaten, and he had his opportunity; for there were two POPES at that time. So King Henry swore that he and all his kingdom should follow the false Pope.

So the true Pope took fright in his turn; and with a baseness rarely equalled by Popes, he offered to sell Ireland to King Henry II., if he would be a good boy in future; and King Henry II. said, "done" to the bargain. That Pope was Alexander III., whom we had occasion to mention in our article on "the Blessed Cornelius" in our number for November, 1855.

This is the secret history of the sale of Irish nationality. So all Irishmen, of every creed and party, have an interest in the story we have been telling. If Pope Alexander's plans had fully succeeded, the sexton of every Roman chapel in Ireland now might murder whom he pleased, and answer for it to the bishops only, without any fear of being tried for his life in the Queen's Court.

Let us thank God that we live under laws which render it impossible that such horrid claims for liberty in the ministers of Christ to murder with impunity can be now urged by Rome. But, let us remember that it was the laws of a free country which at last put down such horrid claims; and let us remember, too, that it must ever be the interest of every free man to maintain the laws of a free country.

¹ Fratres mei dilectissimi, quare non consurgitis mihi adversus malignos? . . . Dominum regem Angliam satis superque sustinuimus. . . . Periculum et intolerabile de cetero nobis visum est, tantum illius officiumque suorum circa ecclesiam Del et ecclesiasticas personas excessus ut hactenus impinitios relinquere. . . . Scriptum illud, in quo illam non consuetudines, sed pravitates potius, quibus perturbatur et confunditur Anglicana ecclesia, continetur, ipsiusque Scripti autoritatem, invocata Spiritus sancti gratia, publice condemnamus, et cas-avimus: universos etiam observatores, exactores, adjuvatores, seu defensores earum excommunicavimus: omnesque vos episcopos a promulgatione, qua contra constitutionem ecclesiasticaem ad earum observationem tenebamini, autoritate Dei et nostra absolvimus.—Con. Gen. x., 1200.

² Eripitur Jesu Christo quod sanguine suo comparavit, in ipsam ejus sortem potestas secularis manum extendit. . . . nec statuta canonum. . . . Clericos quidem patrocinari valent modo, qui ab hac jurisdictione, speciali privilegio fuerint exempti.—Con. Gen. x., 1193.

³ Billingfleet, vol. v., 712.

⁴ Con. Gen. x., 1226.

THE JESUITS.

It is, we believe, well known to our readers, that the Jesuit body were organized originally in the middle of the sixteenth century, for the purpose of resisting the progress of the Reformation throughout Europe; and, undoubtedly, to their efforts the Church of Rome was mainly indebted for the successful resistance she offered to the spread of the reformed doctrines in southern Europe.

Viewed with suspicion by the laity, but patronized by successive popes, the Jesuits soon became identified with the cause of Romanism, and in their ranks the intellectual vigour of the advocates of the Church of Rome was almost exclusively developed. Hated and feared by their enemies, their very name has become a bye-word to describe deceit and falsehood, and to them has been imputed, by both Protestants and Roman Catholics, the inculcation and adoption in practice of that monstrous doctrine—that the end sanctifies the means.

We do not, however, wish here to give currency to all those imputations which Protestant writers have brought against them, but have preferred to try them by the testimony of that Church to which they belonged, and to whose cause they devoted their abilities and energies; and we, therefore, propose to lay before our readers some extracts from the Bull of Pope Clement XIV., by which the order was suppressed. That Bull issued from the Papal See in the year 1773, and is, in every respect, a most remarkable document. It commences by stating the cause of the institution of the society, and after enumerating the privileges conferred on it by successive popes, thus proceeds—"Notwithstanding so many and so great favours, it appears, from the apostolical constitutions, that almost at the very moment of its institution there arose, in the bosom of this society, diverse seeds of discord and dissension, not only amongst the companions themselves, but with other regular orders—the secular clergy, the academies, the universities, the public schools, and, lastly, even with the princes of the states in which the society was received.

"These discussions and disputes arose sometimes concerning the nature of their vows—the time of admission to them—the power of expulsion—the right of admission to holy orders without a sufficient title, and without having taken the solemn vows;—sometimes concerning the absolute authority assumed by the general of the said order, and on matters relating to the good government and discipline of the order. In short, accusations of the gravest nature, and very detrimental to the peace and tranquillity of the Christian republic, have been continually made against the said order. Hence the origin of that infinity of appeals and protests against this society which so many sovereigns have laid at the foot of the throne of our predecessors."

The Bull then mentions that Philip II. of Spain (probably the most bigoted ruler that the world ever saw) appealed to Sixtus V. against the society, and that Sixtus, convinced that his objections were just and well founded, did, without hesitation, comply therewith, and in consequence named a distinguished bishop to visit and examine the matter; but that Gregory XIV., the successor of Sixtus, not only refused to hear the accusations against the order, but even ordered, under pain of excommunication, that no person should presume to attack the order. The Bull further proceeds to say—"Who would have thought that even these dispositions should prove ineffectual towards appeasing the cries and appeals against the society, which many represented as contrary to the orthodox faith and to sound morals. The dissensions among themselves, and with others, grew every day more animated; the accusations against the society were multiplied without number, and especially against that insatiable avidity of temporal possessions with which it was reproached. Hence the rise, not only of those well-known troubles which brought so much care and solicitude upon the Holy See, but, also, of the resolutions which certain sovereigns took against the order."

The Bull then states an order of the society itself, in 1606, prohibiting its members from interfering in temporal matters, and again proceeds—"We have seen, in the grief of our hearts, that neither these remedies, nor an infinity of others since employed, have produced their due effect, or silenced the accusations and complaints against the said society. Our other predecessors (naming eleven different popes) employed, without effect, all their efforts to the same purpose. In vain did they endeavour, by salutary constitutions, to restore peace to the Church, as well with respect to secular affairs—with which the company ought not to have interfered—as with regard to the missions, which gave rise to great disputes and oppositions on the part of the company; as, likewise, concerning the meaning and practice of certain idolatrous ceremonies adopted in certain places, in contempt of those justly approved by the Catholic Church; and further, concerning the use and explanation of certain maxims which the Holy See has,

with reason, proscribed as scandalous, and manifestly contrary to good morals; and, lastly, concerning other matters of great importance, and prime necessity, towards preserving the integrity and purity of the doctrines of the Gospel; from which maxims have resulted very great inconveniences, and great detriment, both in our days and in past ages—such as the revolts and intestine troubles in some of the Catholic states, and the persecutions against

the Church in some countries of Asia and Europe. After so many storms, troubles, and divisions, every good man looked forward with impatience to the happy day which was to restore peace and tranquillity. But under the reign of Clement XIII. the times became more difficult and tempestuous; complaints multiplied on every side; in some places dangerous seditions arose, tumults, dissensions, scandals, which, weakening, or entirely breaking the bonds of Christian charity, excited the faithful to all the rage of party hatreds and enmities. Desolation and danger grew to such an height that the very sovereigns, whose piety and liberality towards the company were so well known as to be looked upon as hereditary in their families—we mean our dearly-beloved sons in Christ, the kings of France, Spain, Portugal, and Sicily—found themselves reduced to the necessity of expelling and driving from their states, kingdoms, and provinces, these very companions of Jesus; persuaded that there remained no other remedy to so great evils, and that this step was necessary, in order to prevent the Christians from rising one against another, and from massacring each other, in the very bosom of our common mother, the Holy Church. Our said dear sons having since considered that even this remedy would not be sufficient towards reconciling the whole Christian world, unless the said society was absolutely abolished and suppressed, made known their demands and wills in this matter to our said predecessor, Clement XIII. They united their common prayers and authority to obtain that this last method might be put in practice, as the only one capable of assuring the constant repose of their subjects, and the good of the Catholic Church in general."

"Actuated by so many and important considerations, and, as we hope, aided by the presence and inspiration of the Holy Spirit; compelled besides by the necessity of our ministry, which strictly obliges us to conciliate, maintain, and confirm the peace and tranquillity of the Christian republic; having further considered that the said company of Jesus can no longer produce those abundant fruits, and those great advantages, with a view to which it was instituted and approved of by so many of our predecessors, and endowed with so many and great privileges: that, on the contrary, it is very difficult, not to say impossible, that the Church should recover a firm and durable peace so long as the said society subsisted; in consequence hereof, and forced by other motives which prudence and the good government of the Church have dictated, after a mature deliberation, we do, out of our certain knowledge, and the fulness of our apostolical knowledge, suppress and abolish the said company; we deprive it of all activity whatever in its houses, schools, colleges, hospitals, lands, and, in short, every other place whatsoever; we abrogate and annul its statutes, rules, customs, decrees, and constitutions, even though confirmed by oath, and approved by the Holy See, or otherwise."

Such was the tenor of the famous Bull by which the Society of Jesuits was suppressed; and, if we examine it carefully, the main grounds on which the condemnation was rested, and on account of which the infallible judge passed sentence on the society, were these—

First—An insatiable desire for temporal possessions and undue interference in the internal affairs of those states in which they were established;

Secondly—Disturbance of the Church by these intrigues;

Thirdly—The encouragement in their missions of idolatrous practices;

And, fourthly—The use of maxims, with reason proscribed as scandalous, and manifestly contrary to good morals, and from which the Bull alleges the revolts and intestine troubles of some of the Catholic states proceeded.

These are the charges which the Bull alleges were proved against the society, and on account of which the kings of France, Spain, Portugal, and Naples banished the society from their dominions; and, not content with that, demanded the entire suppression and abolition of the order. And yet, in the nineteenth century, Rome again leagues herself with the Society of Jesuits, again evokes their activity, and restores their organization. Have, then, the Jesuits abandoned these principles and maxims, so emphatically condemned by the Bull of Pope Clement XIV.? If they have, what proof has been given to the world of such abandonment? or what record exists of their repentance, and renunciation of them? If they have not abandoned them, then, surely, by their restoration, Rome proclaims to the world her sanction of that insatiable avidity of temporal possessions, and of that undue interference in the internal affairs of other states, which distinguished the Jesuits, and declares her approbation of those maxims which encouraged revolts and intestine troubles even in Roman Catholic states. In future numbers we shall refer to the historical facts which abundantly justified the condemnation contained in the Bull.

WHAT IS NOT IN THE DOUAY TESTAMENT.

We had pleasure last month in giving publicity to the statement made by Mr. O'Hagan at the trial of Father Petcherine, that during the last seven years 400,000 copies of the Douay translation of the Scriptures had been circulated. We should be glad to think that one of these copies had found its way to each of our Roman Catholic readers. Nothing would please us more

them to be assured that every intelligent Roman Catholic who casts his eye over our pages had the means at hand of testing whether our statements be in accordance with, or in opposition to, the Word of God. And we have repeatedly said that our columns are freely open to any Roman Catholic who can show that any assertions of ours are contradicted by the teaching of his Douay Bible.

If, as we hope, these lines are read by many Roman Catholics who are possessed of a copy of this translation of the Scriptures, we invite them to an examination of the contents of that book, which, their own Church assures them, is the Word of God Himself, dictated by the Spirit of truth for the infallible teaching of his Church.

Our readers need not be afraid that we shall perplex them in this article with wrangling as to the right translation of this or that text, or the correct interpretation of this or that disputed passage. We wish here only to take a general survey of the contents of the volume; and instead of contending about the meaning of some of the things that are in the book, to call attention to some points which undoubtedly are not in it.

1. First, then, we dare say many Roman Catholics will own it to be somewhat remarkable that from one end of the book to the other there is not the slightest mention of the Bishop of Rome. It is taught now-a-days that the Pope is appointed by God as the infallible guide of Christendom, and that he inherits this prerogative as the successor of St. Peter, who was the first Bishop of Rome. If this is true, is it not somewhat remarkable that the Bible does not make the faintest allusion to any Bishop of Rome, or even to St. Peter's having been at Rome at all? We have got a history of the labours of the principal Apostles; we have got a letter written by St. Paul to the Church of Rome; we have got several letters written by St. Paul, while himself resident in Rome: these letters contain several messages to and from the leading Christians of Rome; but among them all, not a syllable about St. Peter. And we have letters from St. Peter himself, one of them written shortly before his death; and yet he does not say a word in them about appointing a successor, nor does he mention any bishop as destined to be entitled head of the Church or to be its infallible guide after his decease.

2. Just as remarkable as the silence of Scripture with regard to St. Peter is its silence as to the existence of any infallible guide for Christ's Church. Roman Catholics believe, that in order to secure Christians from all possibility of error God has furnished them with a living infallible guide; and yet they believe also that this wonderful provision has, in great measure, failed of its intended effect. They hold that a great part of professing Christendom is overrun with deadly heresy; and all because many are unable to convince themselves of the rightfulness of the claims of that Church which makes pretensions to infallibility. Did not God foresee all the errors into which Christians would fall? Did he not know that an infallible guide would not secure them from error unless there was also provided some infallible way of discovering that infallible guide? Is it not strange, then, that the Bible, whose authority is acknowledged by all Christians, should be so silent, when all controversy might have been set at rest if there were but a single text directing all disputes to be submitted to the decision of the Bishop of Rome. On the contrary, though there are several passages where the Apostles warn their disciples that in the times after them heresies should enter the Church, they never allude to this way of detecting heresies: prayer and watchfulness on the part of Christians are the only safeguards which the Bible tells them of.

3. In the third place, we think it is very remarkable that the Bible gives us so little of the life of the Blessed Virgin Mary. We have had much discussion lately on the question of her immaculate conception; but the New Testament says not a word, not merely about her conception, but not a word about her birth—who her father and mother were; what rank of life they were; whether they were young or old at her birth: on all these points Scripture is profoundly silent. There were several holy men, several prophets destined to accomplish certain great works in the Church, who were marked out from their birth by signs and wonders for the task they had to accomplish. Thus, for instance, we are told how the birth of John the Baptist, the forerunner of our Lord, was miraculously foretold by an angel, and how it was declared that he should be filled with the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb. But there is not a trace of any similar narrative with respect to our Lord's mother. Are we not led to the inference that she was not such an important personage in the system of the Evangelists as she is in the teaching of modern Romanist divines?

It is worthy of notice, also, that the Gospels are as silent as to the death of the Blessed Virgin as they are with regard to her birth. We know that, in the Roman Catholic Church, the annual feast is celebrated of her assumption into heaven; but it is certain that wherever the Church of Rome found this story, they did not find it in the New Testament. The New Testament does not tell us how long she lived after the crucifixion, nor where she lived, nor where nor when she died, nor what became of her body. She disappears from the narrative immediately after the ascension of our Lord; in fact, all through the New Testament she is never spoken of

for her own sake, but solely where her connection with the history of our Saviour made it necessary to speak of her.

4. And this brings us to another point—the efficacy of the Virgin's intercession with God. There are numbers of Roman Catholics who feel more confidence in addressing their petitions to her than to Almighty God. God, they think, can do everything, but then, there are many things which he will not do for them. The Blessed Virgin will do anything, and there is nothing which she can't do, or, at least, which she can't get done, which comes to the same thing. It is not our business now to inquire what foundation Roman Catholics have for this belief of theirs; but it is enough here to remark that, in the New Testament, from one end to the other, there is not a single example of any one having asked the intercession of the Virgin Mary; not a single promise that prayers addressed to her will be heard; not a single command to Christians to have recourse to her intercession.

5. And the same may be said as to the intercession of any other saint. Neither by precept nor example are we encouraged in the Bible to depend on the assistance of any saint. All through the New Testament the only mediator we read of between God and man is the man Christ Jesus.

6. It is worth noticing, too, that we read nothing in the Bible as to *relics* of the saints. In those days, what would now be justly considered the most valuable relics could have been had for a little trouble, and yet we are not told of any person taking that trouble. When Stephen was martyred, we are not told of his bones being kept for relics, but his body was quietly buried; and as for other relics, such as the garments of our Lord or of his mother, the wood of his cross, or the bodies of other saints, not one of the New Testament writers ever mention such things being preserved in the Church, or being valued by Christians.

7. As to worship offered to images, we need not speak of it; for there is no mention in the New Testament history of any picture or image, or other personal representation of either our Lord or his mother, or his apostles, or any other holy person.

8. Among the epistles are some pastoral letters, addressed by St. Paul to others whom he had ordained clergymen—namely, Timothy and Titus. Now, among the directions he gives them for the discharge of their ministerial duties, he does not say a word on the subject of *hearing confessions*. Now-a-days the preparation for the confessional is the most intricate part of the studies of the young priest—the most troublesome part of his preparation for his future duties. What, then, are we to infer from the fact that St. Paul passed over the whole subject in silence? Is it not that confession to a priest was no part of the duties of Christians in the Apostolic age?

9. Is it not also very strange that there is so little about Purgatory in the Bible? We are aware that two or three texts are cited by Roman Catholic divines; but these divines say, at the same time, that the texts in question are obscure and difficult, and any candid Roman Catholic must acknowledge that, without the assistance of his infallible interpreter of Scripture, nobody would ever have discovered that they referred to Purgatory at all. Now, if Christians must pass through this fiery ordeal after this life, is it not likely that the Apostles would have plainly told their converts so; is it not likely that they would have consoled them, when suffering persecution, with the reflection that their trials in this life would shorten their torments in Purgatory; and is it not certain that they would have prayed for their departed friends, that they might be speedily delivered from this place of suffering? Now, it is certain that, from one end of the New Testament to the other, there is not one prayer for a dead person, implying that the departed was enduring any purgatorial torment.

10. Again, let us take the doctrine of the Eucharist. We print again (what we copied before in our November number) the passage in which a learned Roman Catholic describes what one who believes in transubstantiation would expect the New Testament to contain on this subject—

"In what way should we expect that our blessed Lord would give us this sublime institution? We might have thought He would have founded it with all the solemnities of Divine Legislator; that it would have been given to us as a boon for which we could never sufficiently thank Him; as a trust the responsibility of which ought to weigh gravely upon our whole lives; as the reward of our faith in Him, over which we might triumph and rejoice perpetually. It would seem as if the Holy Eucharist rather than the Resurrection would be put forward as the reason for completing the number of the apostles, as the prime evidence of the mission and love of the Son of God, and as the glorious end of His merciful coming. We might suppose that the epistles of the New Testament would contain little more than the enforcing of the doctrine of the Eucharist, or the rubrics for its consecration, or the varieties of loving devotion with which it would be our duty to surround it. Yet if we fancied this, we should have shown how little we knew our Lord's way, or had caught the true spirit of the Incarnation."—*Faber on the Blessed Sacrament*, p. 561.

Now, compare with this the actual state of things. Beside the historical account of the institution of the sacrament, we have one or two allusions to it in the epistles, and these by no means indicating that the writers were aware of those mysterious and wonderful miracles which Roman Catholics believe to take place every time the eucharist is celebrated.

We have given ten examples, and it would be easy to give ten more; but we must stop somewhere, and we may as well stop here.

Now, we think our readers can see the reason why it is that while Roman Catholic priests have such an aversion to the authorised version of the Scriptures, Protestants are ready cheerfully to circulate the Douay. We don't think the Douay a good translation, but we believe the Bible to be a book which no translation can spoil.

Our great assertion is, that the Church of Rome has corrupted Christianity by adding to it a number of humanly invented doctrines, and our proof is, that the New Testament is quite silent about these doctrines. Now, it is in vain that Roman Catholics endeavour to manufacture evidence for themselves, by putting a forced interpretation on a passage here, or by giving a mis-translation to a passage there. The whole book is such that no Roman Catholic could have written it.

Would any Roman Catholic publish a collection of lives of saints, and give no life of the Virgin Mary? If we were handed a collection of religious treatises which contained not a word about the claims of the Church of Rome, not a word about the intercession of the Virgin Mary and the saints, no mention of relics or images, no allusion to purgatorial torments, and only one or two allusions to the eucharist, and that in language to which any Protestant would readily subscribe; should we not be certain that these treatises were written either by professed Protestants or by those who were Protestants in their heart?

We ask our Roman Catholic friends to consider the argument we have laid before them. It is one which does not require any learned discussion as to the meaning of particular texts. It is easy for any one to turn over the book and see whether the Bishop of Rome is once alluded to, or to count the places where the Virgin Mary is mentioned, and so to judge whether she was prominently before the minds of the writers.

The conclusion is irresistible, that the Bible was not written by Romanists. And the priests have showed that they think so too; for there is nothing they dislike more than the circulation of the Scriptures. They do not circulate them in any translation at all except where Protestants force them to do it. We should like to see Mr. O'Hagan's 400,000 copies of the Douay matched with a return, of how many copies of the Scriptures the Church of Rome has circulated during the last seven years in Italy or Spain.

WAS CARDINAL BELLARMINE'S CELEBRATED CONTROVERSIAL WORK EVER A PROHIBITED BOOK AT ROME?

It has often been asserted, and has also, by some, been strenuously denied, that the celebrated Controversies of Cardinal Bellarmine were once in the *Index librorum prohibitorum*, and, consequently, condemned at Rome as containing false doctrine, unfit for true Catholics to read.

Is this really true? What is the authority for the statement? and how did the great champion of Romanism incur the displeasure of the Congregation of the Index?

It is an undeniable fact, that Bellarmine's Controversies was once a prohibited book, although it be now no longer so; for the Congregation of the Index enjoy a privilege denied to the Pope; they can retrace their steps, and, if they make a blunder, they can cry *peccavimus*.

But the fact is so. Bellarmine's book was in the *Index*, and the evidence of this fact is convincing.

1. It is asserted by his contemporaries, themselves also Jesuits, and deeply concerned for his fame. Four such writers, Fathers Fuligati, Bartoli, Frizon, and Poussines [or Possevinius], grave and religious men, three of whom were his contemporaries, and all Jesuits, wrote and published his life, at Rome, while many were living who could have contradicted them, and where access might at once have been had to the Congregation of the Index itself, if it had been possible to disprove the statement.

Such testimony would be sufficient, in any ordinary question, to establish historic certainty. But there is, in this case, still stronger evidence. For

2. Bellarmine has himself written a History of his Life, at the request of his friend, Father Eudemon Joannes, and of his General, Father Mutio Vitelleschi. This interesting document remained for long time in MS., but was printed by order of the Congregation of Rites, and put into the hands of the Cardinals at the time when the question of the *Beatification* of Bellarmine was under consideration.

In this work,* in which Bellarmine speaks of himself in the third person, we read (p. 21):—

"Sixtus V., in consequence of the proposition concerning the direct dominion of the Pope over the whole world, put his Controversies into the *Index* of prohibited books

* This autobiography will be found in the *Summarium positionis super Dubio de virtutibus Card. Bellarmini, Anno, 1676, p. 112*. It has been many times printed separately, at Louvain, 1763; Leipzig, 1762, &c.